



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/003,501	10/31/2001	Richard Paul Tarquini	10004010-1	7378

7590 01/27/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

ZIA, SYED

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/003,501	TARQUINI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Syed Zia	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This office action is in response to argument filed on October 03, 2005. Original application contained Claims 1-19. Applicant did not amend or cancel any Claim. Therefore, Claims 1-19 are pending for further consideration.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed October 03, 2005 with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teal (U. S. Patent 6,447,651) as applied to claim 1-19 above, and further in view of Anderson (U. S. Pub: 2003/0014665 A1).

1. Regarding Claim 1 Teal teaches and describes a method of analyzing frames at a node of a network by an intrusion prevention system executed by the node (Fig.1), comprising:
  - reading the frame by the intrusion prevention system (col.4 line 16 to line 28);
  - comparing the frame with a machine-readable signature file (col.4 line 29 to line 40);
  - determining the frame has a frame signature that corresponds with the machine-readable signature file (col.4 line 41 to line 47); and
  - determining the machine-readable signature file has an associated squelch comprising a squelch threshold and a squelch period (col.4 line 48 to col.5 line 8).

Although the system disclosed by Teal shows all the features of the claimed limitation, but Teal does not specifically disclose a signature file that has an associated “Squelch”.

In an analogous art, Anderson, on the other hand discloses computing environment that relates to method and apparatus for providing precise and reliable security authentication using PKI and in addition to the digital certificate utilizing a distributed denial of service *squelch protocol* (Fig.4, [ 0039-0042]).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Teal and Anderson, because Anderson’s method of responding distributed denial of service attack in response to DDoS Squelch filters monitored data by using squelch protocol would not only promote security structure in the system of Teal during receiving data from host computing devices but will also provide safeguards against attempt by unauthorized person to breach security of system.

2. Regarding Claim 10 Teal teaches and describes a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a set of instructions to be executed, the set of instructions, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform a computer method (Fig.1) of:

- reading a frame (col.4 line 16 to line 28);
- comparing the frame with a machine-readable signature file (col.4 line 29 to line 40);
- determining the frame has a frame signature that corresponds with the machine-readable signature file (col.4 line 41 to line 47); and
- determining the machine-readable signature file has an associated squelch comprising a squelch threshold and a squelch period (col.4 line 48 to col.5 line 8).

Although the system disclosed by Teal shows all the features of the claimed limitation, but Teal does not specifically disclose a signature file that has an associated “Squelch”.

In an analogous art, Anderson, on the other hand discloses computing environment that relates to method and apparatus for providing precise and reliable security authentication using PKI and in addition to the digital certificate utilizing a distributed denial of service *squelch protocol* (Fig.4, 0039-0042].

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Teal and Anderson, because Anderson’s method of responding distributed denial of service attack in response to DDoS Squelch filters monitored data by using squelch protocol would not only promote security structure in the system of Teal during receiving data from host computing devices but will also provide safeguards against attempt by unauthorized person to breach security of system.

3. Claims 2-4, 7-8, and 11 are rejected applied as above rejecting claims 1, and 10.

Furthermore, the system of Teal and Anderson teaches and describes a system and method, further comprising

As per Claim 2 disabling execution of a directive of the machine-readable signature file if a frame counter exceeds the squelch threshold (Teal: col.5 line 9 to line 35, col.5line 45 to line 51, and Anderson: Fig.4, [0039-0042])).

As per Claim 3 incrementing a frame counter upon determination that the frame signature corresponds with the machine-readable signature (col.45 line 45 to line 60).

As per Claim 4 determining whether the squelch period has elapsed (Teal: col.5 line 35 to line 51, and Anderson: Fig.4, [0039-0042]).

As per Claim 7 executing a directive of the machine-readable signature file upon determination that the squelch threshold has not been exceeded (Teal: col.4 line 28 to line 58, , and Anderson: Fig.4, [0039-0042])).

As per Claim 8 suppressing execution of a directive of the signature file upon determination that the squelch threshold has been exceeded (Teal: col.5line 35 to line 60, and col. 4 line 16 to line 40 , and Anderson: Fig.4, [0039-0042])).

As per Claim 11 a set of instruction that, when executed by the processor, cause the processor to perform a computer method of periodically incrementing a squelch period timer assigned to the machine-readable signature file (Teal: col.4 line 48 to col.5 line 60, and Anderson: Fig.4, [0039-0042]).

4. Claims 5, 6, 9,12 are rejected applied as above rejecting claims 3, 4, 8, and 11.

Furthermore, the system of Teal and Anderson teaches and describes a system and method, further comprising

As per Claim 5 initiating a new squelch period upon determining the squelch period has elapsed (Teal: col.5 line 35 to line 60, and Anderson: Fig.4, [0039-0042]).

As per Claim 6 determining if the squelch threshold has been exceed by the frame counter (Teal: col.4line 16 to line 40 , and Anderson: Fig.4, [0039-0042]).

As per Claim 9 wherein suppressing execution of a directive of the signature file further comprises suppressing execution of report generation associated with the determination that the frame signature corresponds with the machine-readable signature file (col.5 line 9 to line 22).

As per Claim 12 determining if the squelch period timer equals or exceed the squelch period (Teal: col.5 line 35 to line 51, and Anderson: Fig.4, [0039-0042]).

5. Claims 13-19 are rejected applied as above rejecting claim 21. Furthermore, the system of Teal and Anderson teaches and describes a system and method, further comprising a set of instructions that, when executed by the processor, cause the processor to perform a computer method of

As per Claim 13 re-initiating the squelch period timer upon determination that the squelch period timer equals or exceeds the squelch period; and incrementing a frame counter upon determining the frame signature corresponds with the machine-readable signature file (Teal: col.5 line 9 to line 60, and Anderson: Fig.4, [0039-0042]).

As per Claim 14 determining if a frame counter exceeds the squelch threshold (Teal: col.5 line 9 to line 35, col.5line 45 to line 51, and Anderson: Fig.4, [0039-0042]).

As per Claim 15 suppressing execution of a directive of the signature file upon determination that the squelch threshold has been exceeded by the frame counter (Teal: col.4line 16 to line 40, and Anderson: Fig.4, [0039-0042]).

As per Claim 16 executing a directive of the signature file upon determination that the squelch threshold has not been exceeded by the frame counter (Teal: col.4 line 28 to line 58, and Anderson: Fig.4, [0039-0042])).

As per Claim 17suppressing execution of a directive further comprises suppressing execution of a report generation associated with the determination that the frame signature corresponds with the machine-readable signature file (col.5 line 9 to line 22).

As per Claim 18-19 determining if: the squelch is enabled, the squelch is disabled (Teal: col.4 line 48 to col.5 line 60, and Anderson: Fig.4, [0039-0042]).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Syed Zia whose telephone number is 571-272-3798. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sz  
January 12, 2006